

LETTER
FROM
THE SECRETARY OF WAR,

TRANSMITTING,

In response to Senate resolution of October 4, 1888, report upon a certain order touching the politics of employes in arsenals.

FEBRUARY 15, 1889.—Referred to the Select Committee to Examine the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington City, February 13, 1889.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Senate resolution of October 4, 1888, as follows:

Whereas it is alleged that an order has been issued from the War Department in form and terms as follows:

“[Confidential.]

“WAR DEPARTMENT, ORDNANCE OFFICE,
“Washington, D. C., January 4, 1886.

“To the commanding officers of the national armories at Springfield, Mass., and Rock Island, Ill., and of the United States Arsenals at New York, West Troy, N. Y., and Philadelphia, Pa., Boston, Mass., and Benicia, Cal., etc.:

“SIR: While arsenals and the armory are not intended to be converted into political machines, two political parties in this country are recognized. It is therefore ordered that hereafter, in employing and discharging employes of any and all grades, other things being equal and qualifications satisfactory, Democrats will be favored; the object being to divide the force in the different grades gradually between Democrats and Republicans. This rule will apply to women and children, as well as to men, and will be strictly enforced.

“Respectfully, your obedient servant,

“S. V. BENÉT,
“Brig. Gen., Chief of Ordnance, U. S. Army.”

And whereas it is further alleged that, in pursuance of such order, changes and removals of persons employed by the Government in the United States arsenals and armories have been made, and that honorably discharged soldiers of the Union Army and their wives and children have thus been removed: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby directed, to forthwith transmit to the Senate full information as to the order above named, and to state fully what necessities of the Department required that said order should be issued; and to further inform the Senate why an order issued from the military department of the Government upon public business was marked “confidential;” and also to report fully all changes that have been made of persons employed in the United States arsenals and armories since said order was issued, and especially to inform the Senate whether, at Rock Island Arsenal, the wife and children of a former Union soldier have been removed under said order; and also to inform the Senate what measures, if any, have been taken by the War Department to learn the political opinions of the women and children in its employ.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is further directed to transmit to the Senate copies of any further orders or circulars relating to the employment of persons in any part of said Department since March 4, 1885, together with copies of all correspondence between the Department and any of its officers or subordinates, or any other person, relating to the politics of any of its employés.

In reply to these resolutions I have the honor to say that during the year 1885 there were numerous applications made to me by or in behalf of mechanics, artisans, and other persons, for employment in the arsenals and armories in charge of this Department. Of course, it is well understood that this employment does not fall within the civil-service law. Though called to the attention of the Civil-Service Commission, no practical method has been found to bring this class of employés within its provisions. No change has therefore been made in the manner of appointment. The head of the Department still delegates it to the Chief of Ordnance, who in turn places the performance of this duty in the officer in charge of the arsenal or armory wherein the work is to be performed. He determines on examination whether the applicant is fitted and able to do the required work. The same rule obtains in the other Bureaus.

These applications were made mainly by persons who claimed as Democrats to have been hitherto excluded from such employment on account of their political opinions. The reply made to such applications was that no removals would be made of deserving and efficient workmen in these shops merely on account of their political opinions, but as vacancies occurred, if the applicants were competent to perform the work required and otherwise qualified, and their services needed, they would be received. This decision in regard to removals or discharges of such employés has been strictly adhered to; and none have been made in the Ordnance Bureau or in any Bureau of this Department since I have been Secretary of War, except for cause; such as inefficiency, misconduct, dishonesty, long-continued absence, reduction of force, and like reasons.

In conversation with the Chief of Ordnance on this subject of labor in the arsenals early in January, 1886, the suggestion was made by me that as it seemed to be conceded on the one side, or claimed on the other, that a majority of these places were held by Republicans, that as vacancies occurred, or as the force might be increased in any arsenal, these places should be filled by Democrats, their fitness and other qualifications being sufficient and equal to their competitors, until the numbers were substantially divided between the two political parties, and that condition should be afterwards maintained so far as practicable. To the same end, when a reduction of force became necessary, that the same rule should be applied, until the same equality was obtained. The Chief of Ordnance favored and approved the proposal for reasons which he states in his report. He was of opinion that the process of thus equalizing the force would be gradual and slow, because the number of employés is not large, and considerable changes did not often occur.

The circular issued on January 4, 1886, and set forth in the resolution of the Senate, I did not see until the following spring, some two or three months after its issue. This circular does not enlarge or change the decision or rule above referred to, viz: "That no removals would be made of deserving and efficient workmen merely on account of their political opinions." The words "in discharging employés" therein are to be considered in view of that decision, which was a rule of action in the Department, and do not and were not intended to include discharges on account of the political opinions of the persons discharged, as it seems to have been assumed by many not familiar with the facts.

These words were not used in that sense by General Benét, as appears by his report, which is annexed; and even if capable of or liable to a broader construction, they were not so construed or acted upon by the commanding officers at the arsenals to whom the circulars were sent, as appears by their reports.

Colonel Buffington, of the National Armory, at Springfield, Mass., where more than half of these workmen are employed, in his report says that "the circular was duly received, but so far as now remembered, every position at the armory being filled, there was no immediate occasion—the circular not calling for the discharge of any employés—to carry out its provisions. Since vacancies have occurred from death, resignation, and other causes, and these vacancies were filled at once—necessary in most cases to prevent a break in the routine of armory work—but fitness alone controlled; a case of equal fitness but of opposite politics not so far as known presenting itself for the application of the provisions of the circular." There have been but sixty-four changes of permanent workmen at Springfield Armory since January, 1866, in a force of about 480 men. Only one woman is there employed.

It will also be found on examination of the reports of the commanding officers of other arsenals that no removals or discharges in the force employed have been made under the circular of January, 1866. It also appears from these reports that the force of workmen employed is somewhat permanent in its character.

In the larger arsenals, as at Springfield, the vacancies have been few, and in the smaller hardly any changes in the force have been made.

I do not know of any reason other than that given by General Benét why the order should have been marked confidential. I had no desire to conceal it from any person, and did not, but spoke freely when talking upon the subject of the policy of dividing the force, as has been described. Nor have any measures been taken by the War Department to learn the political opinions of the women and children in its employment. General Benét states in his report the reason for the allusion to women and children in his circular, as follows:

The portion of the circular referring to the application of the rule to women and children appears particularly to have been misunderstood. There was no intention whatever of causing the discharge of women and children because of their holding or not holding any particular political opinion, but a long and varied experience in the employment of women and children in our arsenals had personally shown me that criminations and recriminations on the score of the loyalty or disloyalty, or of the political opinions of husbands and fathers, were as prevalent among this class as among the men employed. It was in order that the good effect sought to be obtained by the political neutralization of the adult male portion of the working force should not be weakened by allowing it to exist in the female and juvenile portion that the concluding sentence was added.

I am further requested to inform the honorable Senate whether, at Rock Island Arsenal, the wife and children of a former Union soldier have been removed under the order issued by the Chief of Ordnance. In reply to this I beg to invite attention to the report of the commanding officer of the Rock Island Arsenal, in which he positively states that "the wife and children of a former Union soldier were not removed from here under or by reason of said confidential circular" of January 4, 1866. He asserts that the occurrence did not take place at the Rock Island Arsenal. In the reports from all the arsenals it appears that no such transaction as described occurred in any arsenal or armory of the United States.

The commanding officer of Rock Island Arsenal, where the event which called forth this inquiry is assumed to have occurred, also says that he

has endeavored to find Mr. J. Q. Ellery, whose name is signed to the letter said to have been received by the Indianapolis Journal newspaper and which was read in the Senate, and to ascertain from him the names of the persons alleged to have been dismissed. In this effort he has not been successful, and an examination of the assessor's books in the county clerk's office for the years 1884, 1885, and 1886 fails to disclose Ellery's name among the residents of Rock Island County. Inquiry among the oldest residents also failed to discover "any one who ever knew such a man." These facts, taken in connection with the reports from all other arsenals of the United States denying that such discharge of a woman and her children had been made, seem to establish conclusively that the signature to the letter was false, and the facts alleged therein and the statements purporting to have been made by the commanding officer are untrue and without any foundation whatever.

I am not aware of any further orders or circulars relating to the employment of persons in the War Department since March 4, 1885, as called for by the resolution, and inquiries directed to the chiefs of bureaus of the War Department establish the fact that none have been issued.

The only correspondence between the Department and any of its officers or subordinates or any other person relating to the politics of any of its employés since March 4, 1885, upon which action was taken by the Department, arose in regard to the employés on the Louisville and Portland Canal, under the charge of the Chief of Engineers, and the Jeffersonville, Ind., depot of the Quartermaster's Department.

In the first case reports came to me that the canal was not properly managed; that the superintendent in charge did not do his duty, and that the employés were used for political purposes. A long newspaper correspondence occurred on these subjects, and other matters connected with the canal between the engineer officer in charge of the work and one Mr. O. H. Stratton. From this cause several investigations took place, resulting ultimately in the discharge by my order of Phil. J. Schopp from the position of superintendent and the appointment of Thomas H. Taylor in his place, being convinced that such change was necessary and for the best interests of the service. An assistant superintendent and a clerk were afterwards appointed by the engineer in charge of the work. Since that time no changes by discharge or appointment of canal officers have been made or required. Numerous letters and newspaper articles on the subject of the management of the canal, the evidence taken in a hearing by the officer in charge, and his report thereon was sent to and are now at the War Department, the copying of which would require more labor than can well be spared from the more important work in hand. The original papers can readily be furnished if desired. Copies of the following papers on the subject are herewith:

- (1) Memorandum report on the charges made by Mr. O. H. Stratton, by General John Newton.
- (2) Letter from office of the Chief of Engineers to Colonel Merrill.
- (3) Colonel Merrill's report, with indorsement by the Secretary of War, directing the appointment of Mr. Thomas H. Taylor as superintendent of the Louisville and Portland Canal in place of Phil. J. Schopp, to be removed.

The other case was at the Jeffersonville depot, under the charge of the Quartermaster-General. Numerous complaints were made from various sources, including the press in the vicinity, in regard to the management and condition of the force of employés in this depot. These complaints covered much ground, and among other things it was said

that the employés were permitted to give their Government time to politics, and that some were active political partisans. After some ineffectual attempts to ascertain the truth of these various charges, and being of opinion that the necessity for maintaining the office of the depot at Louisville, and the importance of continuing the depot itself, should be inquired into, upon recommendation of the Quartermaster-General Major Farnsworth, Inspector General, was detailed to investigate the same.

The several matters of inquiry that Major Farnsworth was to make were contained in his letter of instructions from the Adjutant-General, copies of which, and of other papers relating to the inspection, including the report of Major Farnsworth and the action of the Department thereon, are annexed to this reply. He reports in favor of the continuance of the depot at Jeffersonville and the abandonment of the office at Louisville.

In regard to politics it is to be noticed that Major Farnsworth reports that the employés of the depot are about equally divided in numbers between the Democratic and Republican parties; they are required to be at their duties during regular hours, and could not, therefore, devote Government time to politics. He recommends the discharge of the chief clerk of the depot, the inspector, and the chief teamster, and the transfer of the property clerk to some other field of service. The report of Major Farnsworth was received by me and approved with the remark that the recommendations therein be carried out by the Quartermaster-General.

It is believed, after a full and extended research, that these cases are the only ones that have occurred wherein correspondence took place between the Department and its officers, subordinates, and other persons, and that the foregoing fully answers all points presented by the resolution. This reply has been delayed by the necessity of carefully examining the records of the War Department in order that full reply might be made, and in endeavoring to discover the writer of the letter signed J. Q. Ellery. On this last point no positive information has thus far been obtained.

There are on file in the Department other communications relating to the politics of persons employed, but as no action has been taken thereon, so far as removals or changes of force are concerned, they have not been considered to fall within the scope of the inquiry of the honorable Senate. They will be furnished if desired.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM C. ENDICOTT,
Secretary of War.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

FORT MONROE ARSENAL,
Fort Monroe, Va., October 8, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated October 6, 1888, inclosing copy of Senate resolution dated October 4, 1888, and to report that no changes whatever have been made in the personnel of this post by reason of the confidential circular of January 4, 1886.

No inquiry has been made as to the political opinions of any employé or his family and they are to me unknown. There are no women nor children employed at this arsenal.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

ISAAC ARNOLD, JR.,
Major of Ordnance, Commanding.

THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C.

WATERTOWN ARSENAL,
Watertown, Mass., October 15, 1888.

SIR: The letter of the 6th instant from the Ordnance Office inclosing a copy of Senate resolution dated October 4, 1888, and calling for a report as to what action had been taken at this arsenal under the confidential circular of January 4, 1886, from the Chief of Ordnance, came during my absence on duty. I have now to report in answer thereto, that no changes of employes whatever have been made at this arsenal by reason of said circular; that the political opinion of no person employed—man, woman, or child—has been inquired into, and that no one has been either employed or discharged on account of political opinion, and that no wife or child of a former Union soldier has been removed under or by reason of said confidential circular.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

F. H. PARKER,
Lieutenant-Colonel, Ordnance Department, U. S. Army, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

FRANKFORT ARSENAL,
Philadelphia, Pa., October 3, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your circular letter of the 2d instant, calling for a report in detail of what action, if any, was taken at this post in carrying out the provisions of your confidential circular of January 4, 1886, and in reply thereto to state that no action to my knowledge has been taken at this post in carrying out the provisions of the circular mentioned while I have been in command, and I am confident no such action has been taken without my knowledge.

As the circular referred to was confidential to the officer who was in command of the post at that time, if he took any action in the matter it must have been unofficial, known only to himself; there is no record here in regard to it, and I have no means of reporting in regard to it.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

D. W. FLAGLER,
Lieutenant-Colonel of Ordnance, Commanding

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

[Copy of indorsement.]

BENICIA ARSENAL, CAL., October 8, 1888.

Respectfully returned to the Chief of Ordnance, U. S. Army. No action growing out of the confidential circular, referred to within, has been taken at this arsenal.

S. CRISPIN,
Colonel of Ordnance, Commanding.

WATERVLIET ARSENAL,
West Troy, N. Y., October 3, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to state in reply to your letter of the 2d instant, that I have taken no action in carrying out the provisions of confidential circular of January 4, 1886, never having received one of them officially. I reported for duty here June 5, 1886. On August 4, 1886, I received from the War Department circular of July 22, 1886, which was a communication from the President on the duties of office-holders as regards politics. I interpreted the latter as leaving such matters to my discretion as a non-partisan.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. M. WHITTEMORE,
Colonel, Ordnance Department, U. S. Army, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

SAN ANTONIO ARSENAL,
San Antonio, Tex., October 11, 1888.

SIR: Acknowledging the receipt of your communication of the 6th instant, inclosing a copy of Senate resolution, dated October 4, 1888, and requesting immediate report as to my action under the confidential circular of January 4, 1886, I have to report that no changes have been made by me of persons employed in this arsenal since the date of said circular by reason of said circular; and I am informed that none were made by my predecessor.

The wife and children of a former Union soldier could not have been removed for the reason that no such persons have been employed at this arsenal.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

L. S. BABBITT,
Major of Ordnance, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

[Copy of indorsement.]

KENNEBEC ARSENAL, October 23, 1888.

Respectfully returned.

I have never seen the "confidential circular" of January 4, 1886; can find no record of its ever having been received here, or the faintest indication that its suggestions have ever been carried out.

O. E. MICHAELIS,
Captain of Ordnance, Commanding.

ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL,
Rock Island, Ill., October 8, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, inclosing a copy of the Indianapolis Journal of the 29th ultimo, in which a letter from J. Q. Ellery, dated Rock Island, Ill., September 22, 1888, stating that his sister and her two daughters were discharged about six months ago because they were Republicans, etc., and requesting me to ascertain from Mr. Ellery and report to you the names of his sister and her two daughters, and the Arsenal from which they were discharged.

In reply I have to report that a close examination of the assessor's books in the county clerk's office for the years 1884-'85-'86 fails to disclose the name of J. Q. Ellery amongst the lists of residents of Rock Island County, and upon inquiry of some of the oldest residents no one can be found who ever knew such a man.

I would further report that the records of this arsenal do not show any such occurrence as that described in the newspaper, nor have I any knowledge of the transaction referred to in J. Q. Ellery's letter.

The newspaper is returned herewith as requested.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

T. G. BAYLOR,
Colonel of Ordnance, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL,
Rock Island, Ill., October 10, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, at this date, of your letter of October 6, 1888, inclosing copy of Senate resolution dated October 4, 1888, and directing me to make an immediate report as to my action under the confidential circular of January 4, 1886.

In response thereto I have to report that I have made no changes in the persons employed at this arsenal since the date of said circular by reason of or in obedience to said circular; and, further, that the wife and children of a former Union soldier were not removed from here under, or by reason of, said confidential circular of January 4, 1886. No effort has been made to ascertain the political opinions of women and children when employed.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

T. G. BAYLOR,
Colonel of Ordnance, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

[Telegram.]

BENICIA, CAL., October 12, 1888.

To the CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.:

No action whatsoever has been taken at this arsenal growing out of the Benét confidential circular of January 4, 1886, either in the cases of men, women, or children. No measures have been taken to learn the political opinions of women and children.

R. CRISPIN,
Colonel, Commanding.

INDIANAPOLIS ARSENAL,
Indianapolis, Ind., October 10, 1888.

SIR: In compliance with your instructions of the 6th instant I have the honor to report that no changes of persons employed at this arsenal have been made by reason of the confidential circular from the Department of January 4, 1886; that the wife and children of a former Union soldier have not been removed under or by reason of said confidential circular, and that no measures have been taken to learn the political opinions of employés at this arsenal.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

CLIFTON COMLY,
Major of Ordnance, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

ALLEGHENY ARSENAL,
Pittsburgh, Pa., October 9, 1888.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 6th instant I have the honor to state that I assumed command of this arsenal May 27, 1886.

I do not know that any changes were made of persons employed at this arsenal, in consequence of circular of January 4, 1886, prior to my taking command, but not a single change on that account has taken place during my incumbency. "The wife and children of a former Union soldier" have not been removed "under or by reason of said confidential circular." No measures have been taken to learn the political opinions of any employé. I only demand that the employé shall be a good workman, and I do not know, and do not want to know, the political opinion of any man under my command or in my employ.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

GEO. W. MCKEE,
Major of Ordnance, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

WATERVLIET ARSENAL,
West Troy, N. Y., October 8, 1888.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 6th instant, inclosing a copy of Senate resolution dated October 4, 1888, I have the honor to report that no changes were made by me under circular of January 4, 1886, and so far as known to me none were made by my predecessor, by whom said circular was received. No women or children are employed at this arsenal.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. M. WHITEMORE,
Colonel, Ordnance Department U. S. Army, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES POWDER DEPOT,
Dover, N. J., October 9, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your circular letter of the 6th instant, calling for a report as to changes that have been made at this depot since the date of the confidential circular of January 4, 1886, and which were made by reason

of said circular; "and especially whether at your arsenal the wife and children of a former Union soldier have been removed under or by reason of said confidential circular of January 4, 1886, and what measures, if any, have been taken to learn the political opinions of the women and children in your employ."

In reply, I have the honor to report that at the time of the receipt of the circular the politics of the employés was unknown to the commanding officer, but as careful an investigation as possible was made, which resulted in the discovery that even during the busiest season, and before the receipt of the circular, when sixty-seven men were employed, twenty-five were Democrats, twenty-four were Republicans, and eighteen were unnaturalized or under age. No discharges or changes have ever been made by reason of this circular. During the winter season, and when the appropriations have given out, a reduction of the force was made, but the same men were, when possible, re-employed when work was resumed.

No married woman or widow was ever employed here, and the only child of a former Union soldier was the son of a veteran, a boy about seventeen years of age, who was employed as a kind of helper. His discharge was made necessary by the stoppage of work. His father is employed as a watchman now. No effort was made to ascertain his political opinions.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

FRANK H. PHIPPS,
Major of Ordnance, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

FRANKFORD ARSENAL,
Philadelphia, Pa., October 12, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of October 6, 1888, inclosing a copy of Senate resolution dated October 4, 1888, calling for a report thereunder, and in reply to report as follows:

I have been in command of this arsenal since February 28, 1887. During the time of my command there have been no changes of persons employed at this arsenal made by reason of the confidential circular of January 4, 1886, quoted in the resolution; the wife and children of no former Union soldier have been discharged by reason of such circular; and no measures, to my knowledge, have been taken to ascertain the political opinions of any woman or child in my employ or of any other employé at this arsenal.

When the circular was received and during the time prior to my command, if any action was taken by the commanding officer under it the records do not show it; I believe it was only known to himself, and I am unable to report in regard to it, except that the wife and children of no former Union soldier were removed at this arsenal by reason of the circular; and the records show no employés removed at this arsenal by reason of said circular. A careful investigation convinces me that no such removals were made.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

D. W. FLAGLER,
Lieutenant-Colonel of Ordnance, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

[Copy of indorsement.]

SAINT LOUIS POWDER DEPOT,
October 10, 1888.

Respectfully returned to the Chief of Ordnance, U. S. Army.

I found no such order as that referred to on file at this post when I assumed command, and the politics of the few employés is not known. But few men are ever employed here, and with one exception those now on the rolls have been employed "off and on" by the Government for many years.

JOHN G. BUTLER,
Captain, Ordnance Department, U. S. Army, Commanding.

No one has been discharged during the present administration for political reasons.

J. G. B.

WATERTOWN ARSENAL,
Watertown, Mass., October 4, 1888.

SIR: In answer to circular letter received this day asking for a report of the action taken in carrying out the provisions of the confidential circular of January 4, 1886, directing that hereafter the hiring and discharging of employés be regulated to some extent by their political affiliations, I have to report that no action has so far been taken.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

F. H. PARKER,
Lieutenant-Colonel, Ordnance Department, U. S. Army, Commanding.

THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

NEW YORK ARSENAL,
GOVERNOR'S ISLAND, NEW YORK HARBOR,
New York City, October 8, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 6th instant, inclosing copy of Senate resolution dated October 4, 1888, and calling for report of my action under the confidential circular of January 4, 1888.

In reply I would respectfully state that no changes have been made of persons employed at this arsenal since the date of said circular by reason of said circular; no woman or child has been removed under or by reason of said confidential circular of January 4, 1886; and no measures have at any time been taken to learn the political opinions of any woman or child in my employ.

The above is also true of my action at Watervliet Arsenal between the date of receipt of the circular referred to and the date of my being relieved from the command of that arsenal in May, 1886.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. MORDECAI,
Lieutenant-Colonel, Ordnance Department, Commanding.

THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

FRANKFORD ARSENAL,
Philadelphia, Pa., October 3, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2d instant, inclosing a copy of the Congressional Record of October 2, containing on page 9970 what purports to be a letter from J. Q. Ellery, and calling for a report in regard to the statements therein.

I have no knowledge of any transaction mentioned or referred to in Mr. Ellery's letter.

I have tried and can obtain no information or clue to any such transaction at this arsenal as is described in the letter.

The records of the arsenal from January 1, 1886, to the present date have been carefully examined and show no such discharge as that mentioned in the letter, and also convince me that no such discharge has been made.

So far as this arsenal or any act of which I have any knowledge is concerned, I believe the statements in the letter to be without foundation.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

D. W. FLAGLER,
Lieutenant-Colonel of Ordnance, Commanding.

THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL,
Rock Island, Ill., October 5, 1888.

SIR: In reply to your circular letter of October 2, 1888, asking what action has been taken, if any, in carrying out the provisions of confidential circular of January 4, 1886, I have to report that since I have been in command I have not taken any action on this letter as far as endeavoring to equalize the positions of the different employés

between the Republicans and Democrats, and under my predecessor there is no record of any such action having been taken.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

T. G. BAYLOR,
Colonel of Ordnance, Commanding.

THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL ARMORY,
Springfield, Mass., October 3, 1888.

SIR: In compliance with the circular letter of the 2d instant, to report what action, if any, has been taken at this armory to carry out the provisions of the confidential circular of January 4, 1886, I have the honor to report that that circular was duly received, but so far as now remembered every position at the armory being filled there was no immediate occasion—the circular not calling for the discharge of any employés to carry out its provisions.

Since, vacancies have occurred from death, resignation, and other causes, and these vacancies were filled at once—necessary in most cases to prevent a break in the regular routine of armory work—but fitness alone controlled the employment, a case of equal fitness but of opposite politics not, so far as known, presenting itself for the application of the provisions of the circular.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. R. BUFFINGTON,
Lieutenant-Colonel of Ordnance, Commanding.

THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL ARMORY,
Springfield, Mass., October 8, 1888.

SIR: In reply to instructions of the 6th instant, inclosing copy of Senate resolution of the 4th instant, to report as to action under the confidential circular of January 4, 1886, that is, to report fully all changes that have been made of persons employed at this armory since the date of said circular and which were made by reason of said circular, especially whether the wife and children of a former Union soldier have been removed under or by reason of said confidential circular of January 4, 1886, and what measures, if any, have been taken to learn the political opinions of the women and children employed, I have the honor to state as follows:

No changes have been made at this armory by reason of said confidential circular of January 4, 1886.

Sixty-four workmen, who may be called permanent workmen, have been employed to fill vacancies caused by death, resignations, dismissals for violation of standing Army regulations (drunkenness mostly), and on account of increase of work.

Besides these there were a number employed temporarily, such as masons, plumbers, laborers, and others, not now on the rolls. Excepting one woman (not a permanent employé), who has been employed from time to time, when there has been sword work on hand, to burnish the electroplating, no women or children are or have been employed at this armory since January 4, 1886, and none have been discharged for any cause.

No measures have been taken to learn the political opinions of the one woman employed as aforesaid.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. R. BUFFINGTON,
Lieutenant-Colonel of Ordnance, Commanding.

THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE, U. S. ARMY,
Washington, D. C.

AUGUSTA ARSENAL,
Augusta, Ga., October 8, 1888.

SIR: In reply to your instructions of the 6th instant, inclosing copy of Senate resolution of October 4, 1888, I have the honor to report that at this arsenal no occasion has arisen for any action under your "confidential" circular of January 4, 1886, as

regards the discharge of employes. I do not know the political opinions of an employé, male or female, white or black, now or at any time in my employ.

As I read the circular an end was to be put to partisanship in the arsenals. As far as I know this end was accomplished.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. W. REILLY,
Major Ordnance, Commanding.

The CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C.

ORDNANCE OFFICE,
WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to return Senate resolution "of October 4, 1888," on confidential circular from this office of January 4, 1886, to the commanding officers of arsenals and the Army, directing them to "divide the force in the different grades gradually between Democrats and Republicans," "hereafter, in employing and discharging employes of any and all grades, other things being equal and qualifications satisfactory," and applying "this rule to women and children as well as to men," and to report:

The "confidential circular" was issued under the following circumstances:

During an interview with the honorable Secretary of War, on the day the circular was issued, he referred to an application for the employment of a Democrat at an arsenal and expressed his decided objection to making arsenals political machines, or permitting them to come under political control. That such applicants being persistent in the desire for place, the idea had occurred to him that if some way could be devised by which *when the force had to be reduced* and some employes discharged, or when an increase of force had become necessary, those discharged or employed might be so arranged—*fitness being the first consideration*—as to gradually divide the employes *equally* between the two political parties. He thought that such a course would give permanency to the employes, and that neither party would interfere where both were equally represented. This struck me as fair and advisable, and I said that I thought I could put the idea into practical operation. I went to my office, and wrote and issued the "circular" that afternoon; the intention of it being to carry out the views above expressed and nothing more. I did not deem it necessary to inform the Secretary of War of my action as I was taking it to carry out his ideas, and it was not until some time after its issuance that I showed him a copy of it and told him of the action taken.

The "circular" was marked "confidential," because it was intended for the especial information of and as a guide to commanding officers in their action, and its objects could be best carried out if knowledge of it was confined to the officers who alone were expected to act under it.

I could hardly have conceived that a violation of its confidential character, even during the heat of a political canvass, could have been so quickly followed by so much misstatement and misconstruction.

The portion of the circular referring to the application of the rule to women and children appears particularly to have been misunderstood. There was no intention whatever of causing the discharge of women or children because of their holding or not holding any particular political opinion, but a long and varied experience in the employment of women and children in our arsenals had personally shown me that discriminations

and recriminations on the score of the loyalty or disloyalty or of the political opinions of husbands and fathers were as prevalent among this class as among the men employed. It was in order that the good effect sought to be obtained by the political neutralization of the adult male portion of the working force should not be weakened by allowing it to exist in the female and juvenile portion that the concluding sentence was added.

All changes that have been made of persons employed in the United States arsenals and armory since said "circular" was issued are fully set forth in the reports herewith received from the armory and those arsenals to which the "circular" was sent. From these reports it appears that no occasion has occurred for making discharges, except for cause and where, for lack of work, all were discharged; and therefore no occasion has arisen for applying the instructions given in the circular, and in employing men no occasion has arisen for deciding on political grounds. At arsenals and the armory there is great permanency in the hired force, and changes are of rare occurrence.

No women have been employed at the Rock Island Arsenal since June, 1887, except last May, 1888, when one was employed for a few days, cleaning office.

Frankford Arsenal is the only establishment where women are constantly employed in the cartridge factory—average, about thirty.

In a few of the arsenals one female type-writer is employed.

The report from the Rock Island Arsenal emphatically denies that "the wife and children of a former Union soldier have been removed under said order." This charge is based on a letter of J. Q. Ellery, written at Rock Island, Ill., to the editor of the Indianapolis Journal, dated September 22, 1888, copy herewith. The inclosed letter from the commanding officer of Rock Island Arsenal of the 8th instant, in reply to mine of the 4th instant, inclosing copy of the Indianapolis Journal containing the Ellery letter, says that J. Q. Ellery is not known at Rock Island, and an examination of the assessor's books for 1884, 1885, and 1886 discloses no such name. The report from the Frankford Arsenal, where about thirty women are constantly employed, is that no such discharge has been made. J. Q. Ellery's charge, with all its detail, seems to be a fabrication. On its face, the employment of three of a family, when many of the thousands on our pension rolls are glad of work, carried with it grave doubts.

In regard to the political opinions of the women and children in its employ, neither the Ordnance Office nor any of the commanding officers of ordnance establishments have taken any measures to learn their political opinions. No cases came up that required such information. Fitness was consulted, and there being no cases in which other things were equal and qualifications satisfactory, there was no necessity to adopt any other guide save that of fitness alone.

To the second branch of the inquiry, no other circulars or orders have been issued relating to the employment of persons in any part of this Department since March 4, 1885.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. V. BENÉT,
Brigadier General, Chief of Ordnance.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

Reports of ordnance officers as to changes under confidential circular of January 4, 1886.

14

EMPLOYÉS IN ARSENALS AND ARMORIES, ETC.

Arsenal.	Date.	Emp loy és Jan. 4, 1886.	Emp loy és in 1888.	Remarks.
Springfield Armory.....	1888. Oct. 3, 8	462	480	No changes made by reason of the confidential circular of January 4, 1886; no women or children employed or discharged since that date.
Watertown Arsenal	Oct. 4	213	25	No action has been taken to carry out the provisions of the circular of January 4, 1886; that (October 15, 1888) the political opinion of no one has been inquired into, and that no one has been discharged on account of political opinion, and that no wife or child of Union soldier has been removed under the circular.
Fort Monroe Arsenal.....	Oct. 8	15	8	No changes made by reason of circular of January 4, 1886; no inquiry ever made as to political opinions of employés; no women or children employed there.
Augusta, Ga., Arsenal	Oct. 8	8	7	No action under circular of January 4, 1886; does not know the political opinions of any employés now or at any other time.
New York Arsenal.....	Oct. 8	22	18	No changes have been made nor persons employed since date of said circular; no women or children have been removed by reason of that circular.
Watervliet Arsenal.....	Oct. 8	124	118	No changes made by him under circular of January 4, 1886; none, so far as known, by his predecessor; no women or children employed there.
Rock Island Arsenal.....	Oct. 8	219	144	In reply to request to ascertain from a Mr. Ellery the name of his sister and her two daughters, who were discharged from that office, reports that a close examination of the assessor's rolls in the county clerk's office fails to disclose the name of J. Q. Ellery; October 5, 1888, that no action has been taken looking to an equalization of the force, politically.
Do.....	Oct. 10	No changes have been made since date of circular by reason of it, and that wives and children of former Union soldiers were not removed under, nor by reason of, said circular; and no effort has ever been made to ascertain the political opinions of persons when employed.
Powder Depot, Dover, N. J..	Oct. 9	23	15	No changes have been made for political reasons under circular of January 4, 1886, or otherwise.
Allegheny Arsenal	Oct. 9	5	4	Does not know of any changes of persons employed in consequence of circular of January 4, 1886, prior to his taking command (May 27, 1886), and not a single change made on that account since.
Indianapolis Arsenal.....	Oct. 10	2	2	No changes made in consequence of circular of January 4, 1886; no wives or children of former Union soldiers have been removed; and no measures taken to learn the political opinions of any employé.
Frankford Arsenal	Oct. 3	188	131	Has no knowledge of any transaction referred to in letters from J. Q. Ellery, and believes statements to be without foundation.
Do.....	Oct. 12	No changes made by reason of circular of January 4, 1886.
Saint Louis Powder Depot...	Oct. 10	8	3	Found no such order on file when he assumed command; few men ever employed, and, with one exception, those now on rolls have been employed for many years; no one discharged for political reasons since date of circular.
Benicia Arsenal	Oct. 12	44	19	No action taken under circular of January 4, 1886; no women or children dismissed, nor any measures taken to learn political opinions of women and children.
San Antonio Arsenal.....	Oct. 11	39	No changes made on account of the circular, and no wife or child of Union soldier removed.
Kennebec Arsenal.....	Oct. 23	4	Commanding officer states that he has never received the circular, nor is there any record of its receipt or the faintest indication that its suggestions have ever been carried out.

Memorandum of General John Newton, Chief of Engineers, submitted to the Secretary of War.

It is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to attempt a thorough analysis of Mr. O. H. Stratton's written and printed articles. He appears to have an exhaustless flow of words without present prospect of diminution in quantity.

He attacks the management of the Louisville and Portland Canal almost universally; the engineering plans, the good judgment, and even honesty of the officials, in addition to the political management of the work.

Mr. Stratton does not appear to be an engineer or professionally qualified to criticise with authority the ideas and works of experienced engineers, and his articles are besides so voluminous and destitute of precision in expression that, with the exception of requiring Colonel Merrill to read them and make a short reply and explanation in regard to them, nothing more would seem at present to be necessary.

It is different, however, with regard to the political management, and to avoid error in treating this branch of the subject I would suggest that Colonel Merrill be called upon to furnish a list of the permanent force of the canal which should give also the salaries and political affiliations of all. Also the same information regarding the superintendents and overseers of work now carried on, if any, in conjunction with and near the canal, though not strictly in the canal itself.

By this means, if desirable, the patronage pertaining to these works could be properly apportioned.

Mr. Stratton has furnished a lot of affidavits before, during, and after the investigation made by Colonel Merrill under orders from the War Department during the past summer. All of these affidavits were not seen by Colonel Merrill, but Mr. Stratton, who appears to have received a legal education, could have summoned the affiants before Colonel Merrill to testify and be submitted to a cross-examination. They were not all present, and their affidavits, which are *ex parte*, can not fairly be taken as evidence.

Of the persons implicated by Mr. Stratton for political action, viz, Messrs. P. J. Schopp, superintendent; S. C. Cornwell, assistant superintendent, and Robert Oliver, who holds some inferior office, the last only appears to have unduly concerned himself in politics and there is not a great deal against him.

The method before recommended of dealing with the political aspect of the case and of apportioning the offices between the political parties would seem to suit the case and ought to end it, for if the investigation be continued, as Mr. Stratton is absolutely exhaustless in words, no termination appears to be probable.

The investigation already made appears to have been fairly and thoroughly pursued so far as Colonel Merrill could do so, and its incompleteness, if any, arises from the omission of the prosecution to have all its witnesses (assuming the absence of any material witness to the case) present.

J. N.

[Indorsement.]

Respectfully returned to the Chief of Engineers, whose suggestions as contained in the within memorandum are approved and will be carried out.

By order of the Secretary of War.

JOHN TWEEDALE,
Chief Clerk.

WAR DEPARTMENT, December 5, 1885.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1885.

SIR: I am directed by the Chief of Engineers to request that you will furnish, for the information of the Secretary of War, a list of the permanent force employed on the Louisville and Portland Canal, showing the salary and political affiliations of each of such employés. Also the same information respecting the superintendents and overseers of work now carried on, if any, in conjunction with, and near the canal, though not strictly in the canal itself.

By command of Brig. Gen. Newton.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JOHN M. WILSON,
Lieut. Col. of Engineers, Colonel, U. S. A.

Lient. Col. W. E. MERRILL,
Corps of Engineers, Cincinnati, Ohio.

U. S. ENGINEER OFFICE, CUSTOM-HOUSE,
Cincinnati, December 23, 1885.

GENERAL: In reply to your letter of the 11th instant, I have the honor to forward herewith the required "list of the permanent force employed on the Louisville and Portland Canal, showing the salary and political affiliation of each of such employés."

I understand the concluding portion of your letter to refer to the work that has usually been done on the widening of the Indiana Chute, which has always been under the charge of the superintendent of the canal. In relation to this work I would state that in former years it was under the management of W. M. Messick, but during the present year it has been under the management of Mr. Cornwell, the assistant superintendent, who is accounted for in the canal list. On account of the unusually high stage of the river the work was abandoned for the season at the end of two weeks.

I would call attention to the fact that three Democrats and fourteen Republicans were on duty at the canal when it passed into the control of the United States, and these men have been retained because they knew their duties and performed them satisfactorily.

Since the United States has been in charge of the canal twenty-five men have been added to the force, of whom six are Democrats, eighteen are Republicans, and one has no party affiliation.

In conclusion I would state that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, this is the first time that the question of politics has ever been raised in connection with the canal.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

WM. E. MERRILL,
Lt. Col. of Engineers.

Brig. Gen. JOHN NEWTON,
Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C.

[First indorsement.]

OFFICE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, U. S. ARMY,
December 28, 1885.

Respectfully submitted to the Secretary of War.

The list of employés submitted by Lieutenant-Colonel Merrill was prepared in accordance with the instructions of the Secretary of War, contained in the indorsement of December 5, 1885, from the War Department, upon the memorandum of General Newton, returned herewith.

JOHN G. PARKE,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

[Second indorsement.]

WAR DEPARTMENT, January 23, 1886.

Respectfully returned to the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. Thomas H. Taylor, of Louisville, Ky., will be appointed superintendent of the Louisville and Portland Canal, vice Phil. J. Schopp, to be removed.

WILLIAM C. ENDICOTT,
Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to recommend that Maj. H. J. Farnsworth, assistant inspector-general, be ordered to Jeffersonville, Ind., to inspect the officers' accounts and the affairs of that depot. A memorandum of points to which the officer's attention should be especially directed is inclosed.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. B. HOLABIRD,
Quartermaster-General, U. S. Army.

The SECRETARY OF WAR,
Washington, D. C.

[Indorsement.]

Approved by the Secretary of War.

R. C. D.

A. G. OFFICE, *Washington, March 30, 1888.*

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, March 31, 1888.

SIR: I am instructed by the Lieutenant-General commanding the Army to inform you that the Secretary of War directs you to proceed to Jeffersonville, Ind., to inspect the officers' accounts and the affairs of that depot. Upon completion of this duty you will rejoin your station in this city. The travel enjoined is necessary to the public service.

Your attention is invited to inclosed copy of memorandum points, furnished by the Quartermaster-General and approved by the Secretary of War, in this connection.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. C. DRUM,
Adjutant-General.

Maj. HENRY J. FARNSWORTH, *Inspector-General.*
(Through Inspector-General of the Army.)

Memorandum of General S. B. Holabird, Quartermaster-General, submitted to the Secretary of War.

Suggestions of matters at Jeffersonville, Ind., to which the attention of the inspecting officer might be specially directed.

(1) To investigate and report upon the condition and efficiency of the Jeffersonville Depot as such, and particularly as to the necessity or advantage of keeping it up, and as to the practicability and economy of reducing its expenditure to a minimum.

(2) Is there any necessity or any special advantage in keeping up a separate office in Louisville, Ky.?

(3) Muster the employés and verify the regular roll No. 1 as to its accuracy in regard to their employment, necessity therefor, and their

occupation. Whether they are used for any private or any unnecessary purpose.

(4) Is the accountability and its method safe and efficient?

(5) Are the business methods economical and in keeping with the best interests of the service?

(6) Are the duties and responsibilities duly and wisely distributed among the officers and employés?

(7) Report the number of public animals kept for draught or other purposes, whether they are necessary, and if any of them are used for private or unauthorized purposes.

(8) Are there any political partisans employed, and are any of the employés permitted to give their Government time to politics?

(9) Investigate especially the charges that E. H. Baldwin is an offensive partisan, and report upon his character and qualifications as a clerk and give the facts and an opinion of the charges in his case.

(10) Inquire into the character for efficiency of the new employés, and make such suggestions and recommendations generally as seem proper and pertinent to the subject after careful and thorough investigation of the affairs of the depot.

S. B. H.

WAR DEPARTMENT, INSPECTOR-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1888.

SIR: Under instructions contained in your letter of the 31st ultimo I have the honor to report that I made an inspection of the Jeffersonville depot of the Quartermaster's Department on the 7th, 8th, and 9th instant.

I did not inspect the money accounts of the officers there stationed, as I found Col. J. C. Breckinridge, inspector-general, had done so on the 24th ultimo.

I return herewith inclosed the memorandum points furnished by the Quartermaster-General, and answer the same categorically.

First. The condition and efficiency seems good considering the recent change of officers in charge. As the buildings are in good repair, considerable money having recently been expended upon them, and the location central, I see no good reason for breaking up the depot. The expenditures certainly should be reduced to a minimum if not already there. That matter can best be controlled by the Quartermaster-General.

Second. I can see no necessity for keeping up a separate office in Louisville, Ky. No duty is performed there except the preparation and payment of certain vouchers which can be as well done at Jeffersonville. If this change should be made, the following items of expense would be saved: Rent, telephone, considerable ferrriage, services of one messenger, one office wagon, team, and driver. The only advantage, so far as I can see, in maintaining the office is to give an officer an excuse for living in Louisville.

Third. The employés, except cutters and other operatives employed in the manufacture of clothing, etc., who live remote from the depot, were mustered, and roll No. 1 verified and found correct. I could not find that any are used for private purposes.

Fourth. The accountability seems to be in pursuance of law, and therefore as safe and efficient as is contemplated.

Fifth. Less latitude should be given to certain clerks, superintendents, etc., to insure economy and the best interests of the service.

Sixth. In my opinion but one officer is necessary to the efficient discharge of the duties pertaining to the depot. The building is compact and secure. The duties and responsibilities of employés seem wisely distributed, with a few exceptions hereafter mentioned.

Seventh. There are seven horses and two mules on hand at the depot. Two horses are employed in conveying the officer who lives in Louisville to and from the depot in Jeffersonville. Two horses in conveying the two officers who live in Jeffersonville to and from the depot to their residences in that city. Three horses and two mules are employed in depot work, policing, etc. They seem to be necessary under the present state of affairs. I could not learn that they were used for private purposes further than as above stated. They are not branded "U. S." as the regulations require.

Eighth. The employés of the depot are about equally divided in numbers between the Democratic and Republican parties. They are required to be at their duties during hours and could not, therefore, devote Government time to politics.

Ninth. No one questioned would admit to me that E. H. Baldwin had been guilty during the present administration of offensive partisanship, his character is good, his qualifications fair, except that he is too slow for the position of property clerk. No charges in his case were submitted to me, I can not, therefore, report thereon. I do not recommend his discharge but think it would be well if he were transferred to some other field of service as he has been at the depot about sixteen years, in my belief too long.

Tenth. The character and efficiency of the old and new employés compare favorably so far as I can judge from personal observation, the reports of the officers under whom employed, and the report of citizens of the community in which they live.

L. A. Mann, inspector, has been at the depot twenty-one years. He is known to be an offensive partisan; for this and other reasons known to me, I recommend his removal.

Waldemar Wulff, fourth-class clerk, and J. E. Ryan, store-keeper, are reported to have violated the President's warning of July 14, 1886, in regard to obtrusive partisanship; I was unable to establish the fact.

Edward W. Hewitt, chief clerk of the depot, has been allowed to keep at the Government stables two and sometimes three private animals; it is charged that they have been fed, shod, and groomed at the expense of the United States. I believe the charge, although he denies it. He lives in Louisville, although his duties are at Jeffersonville. These animals are used to convey him between these places and are driven by a Government employé. He is accused of collusion with contractors, borrowing money from employés of the depot and failing to return the same under threat of having the complainant discharged. These allegations can only be established before a grand jury. He has been at the depot five years; has been allowed too much latitude and should, in the interests of the service, be removed.

Seth Tomlin, chief teamster, is a party to Hewitt's transactions, and is reported to have been in collusion with certain horse dealers and contractors. He has been at the depot ten years. The service would not suffer by his discharge.

There is serving at the depot a young man named D. A. Dean, who informed me that he had been kept at laborer's work and wages although he holds a civil-service examination certificate, showing him entitled to a \$900 clerkship. He informed me that he believed he was "kept down" because he had in some way incurred the displeasure of Hewitt and Tomlin. I share with him in this belief, and think him worthy of advancement.

Respectfully submitted.

H. J. FARNSWORTH,
Major Inspector-General.

The ADJUTANT-GENERAL, U. S. ARMY,
(Through the Inspector-General, U. S. Army.)

[Indorsements.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1888.

Respectfully forwarded to the Adjutant-General, U. S. Army.

A. BAIRD,
Brigadier and Inspector General, Brevet Major-General, U. S. Army.

APRIL 17, 1888.

The within report is approved, and the recommendations of Maj. H. J. Farnsworth, inspector-general, will be carried out by the Quartermaster-General

WILLIAM C. ENDICOTT,
Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1888.

SIR: Pursuant to instructions of the honorable the Secretary of War, based upon the report of a recent inspection of the Jeffersonville Depot, and with the view to the reduction of the expenses of the depot

to a minimum, you are hereby instructed to discontinue the office at Louisville, Ky., and the expenses connected therewith, after the 30th instant.

Upon the same grounds you are also directed to discharge from the service the following employés, to take effect the 30th instant: Edward H. Hewitt, chief clerk; E. H. Baldwin, clerk; L. A. Mann, inspector; Seth Tomlin, chief teamster.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. B. HOLABIRD,
Quartermaster-General, U. S. Army.

Col. HENRY C. HODGES,
Deputy Quartermaster-General, U. S. Army,
Depot Quartermaster, Jeffersonville, Ind.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., October 15, 1888.

MAJOR: Will you kindly report briefly whether any changes have been made among the employés to make vacancies for political purposes, or whether vacancies have not arisen as ordinary casualties, or have been made for cause, as for inefficiency, etc.?

Also, please report whether any effort has been used to ascertain the politics of women and children. This information is required in order to meet all questions affecting changes made at Jeffersonville Depot under the present administration.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. B. HOLABIRD,
Quartermaster-General, U. S. Army.

Maj. A. G. ROBINSON,
Quartermaster, U. S. Army, in charge of the General Depot,
Quartermaster's Department, Jeffersonville, Ind.

[First indorsement.]

JEFFERSONVILLE DEPOT
OF THE QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT,
Jeffersonville, Ind., October 17, 1888.

Respectfully returned to the Quartermaster-General of the Army, Washington, D. C., with the information that I not only do not know, but can not trace, and do not believe that any employé has been discharged from this depot under the present administration by any officer on political grounds or to make vacancies for political purposes.

Vacancies have unquestionably originated solely from ordinary casualties, and discharges been made on ground of inefficiency or for other good reasons, irrespective of politics.

I am positively assured by Captain Barrett, and sincerely believe, that no attempt has been made to ascertain the politics of women and children or their relatives in connection with their employment in the clothing branch.

HENRY C. HODGES,
Deputy Quartermaster-General, U. S. Army, Depot Quartermaster,
By A. G. ROBINSON,
Major and Quartermaster, U. S. Army.

[Second indorsement.]

QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1888.

A true copy of the report of the officer in charge of Jeffersonville depot, which is approved and respectfully furnished to the honorable the Secretary of War for his information.

S. B. HOLABIRD,
Quartermaster-General U. S. Army.

○

